

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,472	12/12/2003	Yasuyuki Sakai	118061	8818
25944	7590 05/16/2006		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			FLANIGAN, ALLEN J	
P.O. BOX 199 ALEXANDRI	28 A, VA 22320		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3753	
	DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006		6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				· · /_			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/733,472	SAKAI, YASUYUKI				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Allen J. Flanigan	3753				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	•			
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depended for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communicat D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)  🂢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 A</u>	pril 2006.					
		action is non-final.		,			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under &	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
·							
7/63	Claim(s) $\underline{1-9}$ is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) $\underline{4}$ is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	☐ Claim(s) is/are anowed.  ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,8 and 9 is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) <u>5-7</u> is/are objected to.						
·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Examine						
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		=yaminer				
.0,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	·					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			1(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.	•				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
		·					
Attachmen	ot(e)						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	5)	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3753

Applicant's election with traverse of Embodiment I, the tube coupling subspecies of Figs. 7-9, and the tube subspecies of Fig. 4 in the reply filed on 4/5/2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a search of the dozens of possible combinations/permutations of these separate features allegedly could be searched and examined "without serious burden". This is not found persuasive, nor is it a proper traversal. A proper traversal should point out the alleged errors in the restriction requirement, i.e. why the holding of patentable distinctness among these species and subspecies is incorrect (an admission on the record of patentable indistinctness would suffice). Applicant's assertion of undue burden is also not persuasive. Had applicant elected embodiment II or III, it would be conceded, but for Embodiment 1, there are nine different permutations of the different expansion joint and tube configurations possible. All involve distinct features that would have to be searched for and examined.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim 4 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 4/5/2006.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue et al.

Please see the Figs. 23-25 embodiment, which shows every element claimed (note compressing leaf spring 9a and holes 48 formed in the tube ends).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Inoue et al.

The features recited in the above claims are clearly found in Inoue et al.; the rejection is based alternatively on sections 102/103 of the code since it is not clear that there is sufficient teaching or suggestion to use the compressing means shown in the Figs. 9-10 embodiment with the semiconductor cooling

Application/Control Number: 10/733,472

Art Unit: 3753

device shown in the Figs. 23-25 embodiment. Anticipation has been described as being present when each and every element of the claims is found within the "four corners" of a reference, and this is certainly true of Inoue et al. Assuming arguendo that features from one embodiment, clearly shown to be equivalents by virtue of performing the same function (the leaf spring 9a and the tension rods and compression plates of Figs. 9-10), must nonetheless be shown expressly to be combinable with the remaining claimed features or substitutable in different embodiments for anticipation to exist, it would clearly have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the compression means of Figs. 9-10 in place of the U-shaped leaf spring member, such being a mere substitution of known equivalents.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. in view of Ohara et al.

Inoue et al. shows flat cooling tubes of the extruded type in most or all embodiments. It is known in the art that another method of forming a flat, multiple passage tubular structure is through the use of paired plates sandwiching a corrugated sheet/internal fin (see Ohara et al. Fig. 9). In view of the express recognition in the art of the equivalency of forming multiple internal passage flat tubing in these ways, it would have been an obvious substitution of equivalents to form the tubes of Inoue et al. in this manner.

Claims 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Allemandou is cited as an alternative to Ohara et al. The remaining references show electrical component stacks cooled by parallel tubular structures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen J. Flanigan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Mancene can be reached on (571) 272-4930. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Allen J. Flanigan

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3753

AJF